

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
EASTERN DIVISION

SCOTT JOSEPH FAULKNER,	}	Case No. 5:24-cv-00424-ODW-JDE
Plaintiff,		
v.		ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, et al.,		AND RECOMMENDATION OF
Defendants.		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the records on file, including the operative Second Amended Complaint filed by Scott Joseph Faulkner (“Plaintiff”) (Dkt. 20), the Initial Scheduling Order (Dkt. 30), the magistrate judge’s July 29, 2025 Order (Dkt. 35), Plaintiff’s Motion to Request Service of Summons and Complaint by U.S. Marshals and Motion to Request Time Extension for Service (Dkt. 36, “Motion”), the magistrate judge’s August 6, 2025 Order denying the Motion (Dkt. 37), Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. 40, “Reconsideration Motion”), the magistrate judge’s August 21, 2025 Order denying Reconsideration Motion (Dkt. 41), the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge (Dkt. 43, “Report”), and Plaintiff’s Objections to the Report (Dkt. 44). Further, the Court has engaged in a de novo review of those portions of the Report to which objections have


1 been made. The Court accepts the findings and recommendation of the  
2 magistrate judge.

3 Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

4 (1) the Report and Recommendation is approved and accepted; and

5 (2) the Fourteenth Amendment claims against the County of Riverside,  
6 Dep. Myers, Cpl. Lundy, Dep. Bernart, Sgt. Murphy, Sgt. Ibrahim, Sgt.  
7 Tanger, Dr. Cudal, Nurse Sadie, and Dep. Harter; and the Americans  
8 with Disabilities Act claim against the County of Riverside are dismissed  
9 without prejudice.

10  
11 Dated: September 17, 2025



---

12 OTIS D. WRIGHT, II  
13 United States District Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28